

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of June 8, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Applicant provides a summary of the status of the claims:

- Claims 1-8, 12-20, and 24-26 are pending;
- Claims 1-3, 8, 13-15, and 20 have been allowed;
- Claims 9-11 and 21-23 were previously canceled;
- Claims 4-7, 12, 16-19, and 24-26 have been rejected; and
- Claims 4, 12, 16, and 24-26 are amended.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the rejection of June 8, 2009, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

#### ***Examiner's Assertions regarding Basis Beam of Application***

On page 3, lines 15-18, and on page 5, lines 4-7, of the June 8, 2009, office action, the Examiner cites to paragraph 29 of Applicant's specification to define the "basis beam" as relating to a single beam that covers all mobile stations. The Examiner next suggests this restriction regarding the basis beam be incorporated into the claims.

Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the subsequent sentences of paragraph 29 that explain how one or multiple basis beams may be used. See Applicant's Figure 5A (with single basis beam 510) and Figure 5B (with basis beams 512-514). Accordingly, the term "basis beam" is not necessarily limited to a single beam.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-3, 8, 13-15, and 20.

#### ***Rejection of Claims 4-7 and 16-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Bahl in view of Velazquez***

Claims 4-7 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0095486 A1 to Bahl in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0003443 A1 to Velazquez et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 4, as amended, recites:

determining when an entry for a station had been last updated in a table in a wireless access point, said wireless access point configured to form a basis beam to cover said station at least when said station is idle and configured to form a select beam to cover said station when said station is active;

The Examiner acknowledges Bahl fails to teach updating a basis beam. The Examiner relies on Velazquez. The Examiner asserted that the select beams of Velazquez relate to the recited basis beam.

To clarify the distinction between a select beam and a basis beam, Applicant amended claim 4 as recited above.

Velazquez only teaches modifying select beams. There is no suggestion in Velazquez of modifying the basis beam of Bahl. As claim 4 now affirmatively recites a basis beam as a beam that is different from the select beam, the combination of Bahl and Velazquez fails to teach the basis beam. This is because the teachings of Velazquez only apply to select beams, not to Bahl's basis beam. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Bahl and Velazquez.

Dependent claims 5-7 are patentable over the combination at least as being dependent on claim 4.

Claim 16 now recites:

means for determining when an entry for a station had been last updated in a table in a wireless access point, said wireless access point configured to form a basis beam to cover said station at least when said station is idle and configured to form a select beam to cover said station when said station is active;

Claim 16 is allowable over the combination at least for the reasons described above.

Dependent claims 17-19 are patentable over the combination at least as being dependent on claim 16.

***Rejection of Claims 12 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Bahl in view of Velazquez***

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2004/0121810 A1 to Goransson et al. in view of Velazquez. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 12, as amended, recites:

decoding at an access point a first part of a transmitted packet to determine the angle of arrival of said transmitted packet as transmitted from a mobile station;

adjusting a basis beam to ensure coverage of said mobile station based on said angle of arrival;

decoding a second part of the transmitted packet as received via a select beam; and

adjusting the select beam based on information in the second part of the transmitted packet,

...

The Examiner relies on Goransson to teach receiving packets. The Examiner next relies on Velazquez to teach modifying a select beam based on a location of the mobile terminal.

Claim 12 has been modified to clarify that the access point adjusts both the basis beam and the select beam based on information from the packets. While Goransson teaches packets, it does not teach modification of both the select and basis beams based on the information in the packets. Also, Velazquez does not teach modification of the select beam and the basis beam based on information from the packets. Rather, Velazquez is confined to only adjusting select beams based on information from the mobile terminals.

Accordingly, because the combination fails to suggest claim 12 as amended, claim 12 is allowable over the combination.

Claim 24 includes similar recitations and is believe allowable for similar reasons.

***Rejection of Claims 25-26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Park in view of Velazquez***

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,043,272 to Park in view of Velazquez. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 25 now recites:

determine an angle of arrival of said packets based on  
information regarding said packets from said antenna array;

Support for this amendment is found at least in paragraph 49 of the application as filed.

The Examiner relies on Park and Velazquez to teach claim 25 as previously presented. Specifically, the Examiner relies on the GPS information from the mobile terminals in Velazquez to determine the angle of arrival information. Claim 25 has been amended to clarify the angle of arrival information is determined from information from the antenna array regarding the packets. In contrast, Velazquez uses GPS location information from each terminal to identify each terminal's relative angle of arrival. Velazquez does not teach using information from the antenna array regarding the packets.

Dependent claim 26 is allowable at least as being dependent on claim 25.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/  
Christopher R. Glembocki  
Reg. No. 38,800

Dated: November 15, 2009